WIKIPEDIA
The Free Encyclopedia

Talk:Subh-i-Azal

Subh-i-Azal has been listed as a level-5 ***vital article*** in People, Religious figures. If you can improve it, please do. This article has been rated as C-Class by WikiProject Vital Articles.

This article is of interest to the following WikiProjects:

WikiProject Babism (Inactive)

This article is within the scope of WikiProject Babism, a project which is currently considered to be **inactive**.

WikiProject Bahá'í Faith (Rated C-class, Low-importance)

Religion portal

This article is within the scope of **WikiProject Bahá'í Faith**, a coordinated attempt to increase the quality and quantity of information about the Bahá'í Faith on Wikipedia. If you would like to participate, you can edit this article, or visit the project page, where you can join the project and/or contribute to the discussion. If you are new to editing Wikipedia visit the welcome page to become familiar with the guidelines.

C — This article has been rated as **C-Class** on the project's quality scale.

Low — This article has been rated as **Low-importance** on the project's importance scale.

WikiProject Biography (Rated C-class)

Biography portal

This article is within the scope of **WikiProject Biography**, a collaborative effort to create, develop and organize Wikipedia's articles about people. All interested editors are invited to join the project and contribute to the discussion. For instructions on how to use this banner, please refer to the documentation.

C — This article has been rated as **C-Class** on the project's quality scale.

Second sentence opening article is polemical

The second sentence opening the article is polemical and ahistorical. It is only supported by a single source which conveys a Baha'i narrative. Its ahistoricity is proven by the fact that the supporters of Subh-i-Azal instigated a Revolution in Iran during 1905. So how could they have

Archives (**Index**)

- 1

This page is archived by ClueBot III.

dwindled by 1904? Sources to refute the claim being peddled are Mangol Bayat, Janet Afary, Nabavi and literally anyone having worked on the Constitutional Revolution of Iran in recent times. Qalandar303 (talk) 21:12, 1 December 2022 (UTC)

> Hence it must be taken out. Qalandar303 (talk) 21:13, 1 December 2022 (UTC)
>
> > You're welcome to edit productively, but if you removed well referenced statements I will restore them. There are sources indicating that Azalis supported the revolution in 1905, but if you want to say they "instigated a Revolution in Iran" that is a different thing. Even if they were mostly responsible for the revolution, a source needs to indicate their relative size. All reliable sources indicate that Azalis never had more than a few thousand followers that dwindled over time and are currently not very active in the 21st century. **Cuñado** ☼ - Talk 21:40, 1 December 2022 (UTC)
> >
> > > Your reference is a single source and is conveyed in the article polemically. Since Subh-i-Azal is not a Baha'i figure, I would suggest that inclusion of that specific reference by Baha'i editors is in bad faith and so Baha'i editors should stay in their own proverbial lane.
> > >
> > > I have stated that the Azalis instigated the Constitutional Revolution here in the Talk section and not the article. That said, Janet Afary (**The Iranian Constitutional Revolution: 1996**), Mangol Bayat (**Mysticism and Dissent: 1982**) and Siyyid Miqdad Nabavi (**Concealed History: 2013**) - as well as others - have indeed maintained that the Constitutional Revolution of Iran was instigated by the supporters of Subh-i-Azal. Even if we maintain your line that "they supported it," this still problematizes the assertion of the citation saying support for Subh-i-Azal had dwindled. Qalandar303 (talk) 00:16, 2 December 2022 (UTC)
> > > >
> > > > Furthermore, as Afary, Bayat, Nabavi, Manouchehri and others have asserted in their own studies, the Azalis concealed their beliefs and adherence, practicing *taqiya*. Given this, a blanket assertion saying that Subh-i-Azal's support had dwindled by 1904 likewise cannot be maintained because upon what basis has such dwindling been assessed? It certainly cannot be any verifiable assessment, so it must go Qalandar303 (talk) 00:23, 2 December 2022 (UTC)
> > > > >
> > > > > Are any of those available online? I've heard the *taqiya* argument to suggest that we can't possibly know how many, but I don't buy it. Everyone who has looked at them in the last few decades haven't found evidence of a community or leadership. Sources can't report on something that lacks evidence.
> > > > >
> > > > > Are you suggesting Paul Carus was a Baha'i? **Cuñado** ☼ - Talk 01:11, 2 December 2022 (UTC)
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Can you first suggest and tally a complete list of your critical sources before others buy your argument, as you insist that you aren't buying that of others.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I don't know and don't care what Paul Carus's adherence was, and it is not relevant. The issue is that the manner you and other Baha'i editors are placing the citation from his book as the second sentence of the article is polemically motivated, ahistorical and is also deceptive, not to mention unverifiable. Please stay in your own proverbial lane. Qalandar303 (talk) 02:36, 2 December 2022 (UTC)

The source you removed was Paul Carus, and you suggested that it was a Baha'i source. As far as I know it's not. If you have something to contribute, just follow Wikipedia:Core content policies and we'll get along fine. If you have copies of the sources you mentioned, share the relevant parts here. Two of them appear to be behind paywalls, and the other I can't find at all. While accusing me of bias I suggest you check your own bias and ask why you want the references to size removed. **Cuñado** ☼ - Talk 05:23, 2 December 2022 (UTC)

> The reasons have been specified because 1) it is clearly polemically motivated as a second sentence and 2) because it is unverifiable and credible historical sources contradict the assertion. I will add a third one, the source itself is obscure. The suggestion regarding Paul Carus's possible adherence was made by you, and not I. As for Nabavi, see here https://didavarbook.com/products/55553/%D8%AA%D8%A7%D8%B1%D9%8A%D8%AE-%D9%85%D9%83%D8%AA%D9%88%D9%85-%28%D9%86%DA%AF%D8%A7%D9%87%D9%8A-%D8%A8%D9%87-%D8%AA%D9%84%D8%A7%D8%B4-%D9%87%D8%A7%D9%8A-%D8%B3%D9%8A%D8%A7%D8%B3%D9%8A-%D9%81%D8%B9%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A7%D9%86-%D8%A7%D8%B2%D9%84%D9%8A-%D8%AF
>
> And Manouchehri https://bahai-library.com/manuchehri_taqiyyih_babi_bahai
>
> I would like to stand corrected, but Baha'is dealing with the biography of a historical notable who has been explicitly polemicized and demonized throughout their official Baha'i sources by definition cannot maintain a Wikipedia:Neutral_point_of_view or be anything but biased. Please also remember that the present article is not your proprietary. Qalandar303 (talk) 07:12, 2 December 2022 (UTC)
>
> > Thanks for the links, I'll take a look.
> >
> > The size of any religion is usually mentioned in the first paragraph, in my experience, or somewhere in the lead. Articles need to establish notability in the lead. I recently grouped (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Subh-i-Azal&type=revision&diff=1125036271&oldid=1125032017&diffmode=source) the size references at the bottom of the lead to consolidate.
> >
> > Yes I see that you weren't suggesting Carus was a Baha'i. Your three points don't really follow guidelines. He is mainly notably because of the success of the Baha'i Faith and his conflict with Baha'u'llah, so his relation to it should be established in the lead. The size of his following is one of the key points of information needed. It is verifiable. It has reliable sources. I'll check on your other sources but usually this is resolved by adding those sources not removing conflicting sources. I don't understand your suggestion that the source is obscure. I see this as quite simple, if you have **independent** sources that did some kind of demographic survey and assessed Azalis as much larger than the other sources, provide them. **Cuñado** ☼ - Talk 15:52, 2 December 2022 (UTC)
> >
> > > I can read the Arabic alphabet, but I don't speak Persian, so I can't read Nabavi. Can you translate the part you think is relevant?
> > >
> > > Manouchehri says, **For many Bábís the practice of Taqiyyah was a forerunner to their eventual abandonment of their faith. Most of these Bábís had cautiously adopted Taqiyyah and then gradually moved on to severe ties with the Cause even refusing to assist other Bábís.** And later, **A major disadvantage of mass Taqiyyah was the abandonment of the faith by their children and grandchildren.** It's not surprising to see why the practice of publicly denouncing and cursing Azal would lead to a decline in adherents over time. **Cuñado** ☼ - Talk 18:56, 2 December 2022 (UTC)
> > >
> > > > Manouchehri is speculating here. Be that as it may, the fact is he underscores a practice prevalent among the Azalis that then makes it impossible to assert "dwindling numbers" of support for Subh-i-Azal,

especially around the 1904-05 period on the eve of the Constitutional Revolution. That aside, ten times more that number that Manouchehri speculates have left your creed in Iran in recent years, especially since the Islamic Revolution. But you people would fight tooth and nail to say otherwise, even though there is little tangible evidence that there are more than maybe 3-4 thousand actual Baha'is left inside Iran today (whatever inflated numbers you may tell the world otherwise). Qalandar303 (talk) 22:09, 2 December 2022 (UTC)

Thanks for showing your true colors for everyone to see. You might want to read over the core content policies that I linked earlier. Here's one that comes to mind, WP:OR: "Articles must not contain any new analysis or synthesis of published material that serves to reach or imply a conclusion not clearly stated by the sources themselves." **Cuñado** ☼ - Talk 22:34, 2 December 2022 (UTC)

Excuse me? It seems you either inhabit an alternative universe or require a new pair of glasses to read with.The "new analysis" is all yours based on spurious and obscure sources you have cited for polemical purposes thereby demonstrating your true colors as a biased sectarian apologist for a rival creed that openly demonizes and polemicizes the subject of this article. Be that as it may, MacEoin's EI (Encyclopedia Iranica) entry does not assert what Paul Carus says - even though it has its own problems - and by date and content it trumps what some obscure source from the turn of the 20th century asserts. **QED** Qalandar303 (talk) 01:14, 3 December 2022 (UTC)

Do not remove bibliographical sources because they are not Baha'i ones

This is not a Baha'i entry. Do not remove bibliographical entries. — Preceding unsigned comment added by Qalandar303 (talk • contribs) 20:46, 23 January 2023 (UTC)

You added something to the list of references that is not used in the article. I removed it, as well as all the unused references. This kind of references cleanup is standard editing and uncontroversial. If you want to contribute to the article, I suggest you start by reviewing the Wikipedia:Core content policies. **Cuñado** ☼ - Talk 22:58, 24 January 2023 (UTC)

Nonsense. The Azal and Fabrizzio articles are valid references on the subject even though not cited in the entry at the moment. I plan to cite them in the body of the entry at some point. To remove them is a form of unjustified bowdlerization of the entry motivated solely by sectarian concerns. There is no requirement to exclude sources on a subject just because they are not cited in the entry, nor does Wikipedia:Core content policies say otherwise. You have removed these two specific sources simply because the narratives offered by Azal and Fabrizzio regarding Subh-i-Azal contradict official Bahai ones. Both sources are peer reviewed published articles whose journals hold valid and verifiable ISSN numbers that can be easily verified by the appropriate library and journal databases. Qalandar303 (talk) 00:08, 25 January 2023 (UTC)

Generally speaking, references get removed when they are not used, and when they get used they can be easily added to the reference list. Wikipedia:Citing sources mentions a **general reference** that is unlinked to content but might be

useful in building the article. The source you added is not useful in building the article. It is an article that you wrote, that you are trying to promote (there is even a video of you promoting the article last June). It is about a prayer that Yahya wrote. This does not represent a reliable source that can expand on the subject of the article. The prayer could be added to works by Yahya, but there is already a list that Browne considers the 38 greatest hits. I'd love to build the article but you need to explain how this is anything but linkspam and self-promotion. **Cuñado** ☼ - Talk 01:08, 25 January 2023 (UTC)

> One other issue. Academia.edu is not a reliable source and has no editorial review. It is just a place for people to upload their own material, and in that sense it has the reliability of a blog. The author needs to be a reliable source to be included. **Cuñado** ☼ - Talk 01:23, 25 January 2023 (UTC)
>
> That is your opinion based on BAO policy directing your activities to disappear, minimize, erase and/or otherwise exclude sources and sourcing that contradicts official Bahai narratives. However, the subject of this entry is not a Bahai figure. Rather he is a figure you Bahais consider to be a rival to your founder. And contrary to your claims, Wikipedia:Citing sources mentions nothing about excluding sources on a subject merely because they are not immediately cited. If that were so, 2/3 or more of the entries on Wikipedia would have to undergo the same process of bibliographical bowdlerization, including all those hundreds of religion entries vandalized by the BIA Wikipedia cadre that mention Bahai around topics that have absolutely nothing to do with the subject of Bahaism. The first article in question includes a prayer by Subh-i-Azal at its conclusion. The body of that article is inclusive of methodological concerns and an extended critical biography of Subh-i-Azal with meticulous sourcing. If that is not a reliable source then nothing is, and especially the bulk of your sectarian Bahai sources. Again, the article is about Subh-i-Azal which is the topic of this entry, and not on something else. Same with the Fabrizzio piece. Both are peer reviewed journal articles and verifiable. Your concerns are merely attempts at imposing bibliographical whitewash, intellectual bowdlerization and *damnatio memoriae* of a historical figure - in other words, propaganda - as an active policy of the Haifan Bahai administration's aggressive usage of Wikipedia as a public relation's platform to peddle its own narratives, propaganda and corporate spin on history and sources.
>
> Your claim that academia.edu is not reliable is also transparently gratuitous, especially when there are multiple sources throughout Wikipedia that link to academia.edu articles or from archive.edu. Be that as it may, the same article could be linked from archive.edu, and still you would come back with yet another list of made up excuses and rules you cannot actually substantiate to exclude a valid piece since your sole concern here is to impose the official line, constantly shift goal posts against deemed ideological and political rivals, in order to push the narratives of the Haifan Bahai administration against those which contradict it, including those published in peer reviewed journals. This is the case because, as you inferentially admit yourself, the two articles have been merely uploaded to academia.edu. Academia.edu, however, is not their publisher. Their publishers are the journals cited. Both pieces with their journals also bear verifiable **ISSN** numbers International_Standard_Serial_Number that can be brought up and verified via searches of any library or journal database. This should now

completely dismiss to your claim on that score.

Additionally, your flippant tone around the list of Subh-i-Azal's works, calling it "the 38 greatest hits," is also unequivocal in revealing your sectarian malice and bias and so why you should be banned from editing this entry any further. Qalandar303 (talk) 01:25, 25 January 2023 (UTC)

> Qalandar303, administrator here. First of all, the other editor is not likely to be banned--usually a block comes first. See WP:BLOCKBANDIFF. Second, I really need you to stop yelling at the other editor and to cast doubt on their honesty and neutrality: please assume good faith. Thank you. Drmies (talk) 01:58, 25 January 2023 (UTC)
>
> > Their dishonesty and sectarian bias is a matter of public record going on for years, including part of current evidence in an ongoing legal investigation. Given these, good faith cannot be assumed on my part regarding **Cunado**.
> >
> > Can you also cite the specific Wikipedia rule stating that sources not specifically cited in an article are automatically to be assumed as unused. And if so, can you please explain how hundreds (if not thousands) of Wikipedia entries are inclusive of sources that are not actually cited in the body of the entry? Qalandar303 (talk) 02:08, 25 January 2023 (UTC)
>
> I see now what you were fighting over but User:Cuñado was correct: don't put unused citations in the list of references. Thank you. Drmies (talk) 02:02, 25 January 2023 (UTC)
>
> > Please cite the specific rule that states a source around a specific article is automatically deemed unused and not to be included in the bibliography of the entry. Also explain, how it it is that 100s if not 1000s of entries on Wikipedia are inclusive of bibliographical sources not actually referenced in the body of the entry. Qalandar303 (talk) 02:12, 25 January 2023 (UTC)
> >
> > The reference has been made to the article, more are coming, so per your own advise citation to the Azal article in the sources is hereby reinstated. Qalandar303 (talk) 02:23, 25 January 2023 (UTC)

Retrieved from "https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Subh-i-Azal&oldid=1135700943"